

Illinois U Library

TOWN MEETING



June 19, 1955
Vol. 21, No. 8
875th Broadcast

"HOW FAR SHOULD CANADA GO IN FOLLOWING U. S. FOREIGN POLICY?"

Speakers:

M. J. COLDWELL

LEON J. LADNER

ARTHUR LAING

GEOFFREY HARWOOD

Moderator:

ARTHUR HELPS



Town Meeting in Canada
Broadcast from
Vancouver, British Columbia

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time

"HOW FAR SHOULD CANADA GO IN FOLLOWING U. S. FOREIGN POLICY?"

ANNOUNCER: Here, on behalf of the Government of British Columbia, is the Minister of Trade and Industry, the Honorable Mr. Ralph Chetwynd, MLA, with a message of greeting to TOWN MEETING listeners everywhere. Mr. Chetwynd!

MR. CHETWYND: Mr. Moderator, distinguished gentlemen on the platform, and ladies and gentlemen. It was a great pleasure and an honor for Mr. Helps to ask me, on behalf of the Government of British Columbia and the citizens of Canada, and as a citizen of Canada and one who has had a long association with TOWN MEETING IN CANADA, to send greetings to all TOWN MEETING listeners on this continent and abroad. Canada, like the United States, was founded by people of older nations who sought new freedom in the Western world. Today, Canada still welcomes all those who have come seeking freedom of opportunity to work and to worship and to enjoy some of the most beautiful scenery in the world.

Here in British Columbia, for instance, we are fast developing new great industries against the backdrop of a wealth of holiday resources that are enjoyed year round by our citizens and a vast number of visitors.

So from this beautiful city of Vancouver, with its world-famous setting of green forested mountains and sparkling sea, I say greetings and thanks to those who organized this international TOWN MEETING, to Town Hall in New York and to the American Broadcasting Company and to citizens everywhere for the opportunity of being able to visit them by means of this radio. I hope that we may soon have the pleasure of welcoming you on a personal visit to Canada, and particularly may I say -- Welcome to British Columbia.

ANNOUNCER: Thank you, Mr. Chetwynd. And now, the founder of TOWN MEETING IN CANADA, Mr. Arthur R. Helps!

MR. HELPS: It is with a feeling of pride and honor that we have accepted this offer to cooperate with AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR in producing this international TOWN MEETING -- a joint broadcast of AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR and TOWN MEETING IN CANADA.

Canada's TOWN MEETING was originally founded with the cooperation of Town Hall, Inc., in November, 1943, and since that time has continued to produce a once-a-week broadcast, always conscious of the high standard and pattern set by AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR.

On this unique occasion we find a widely famous U. S. institution of freedom cooperating in the discussion of a subject by citizens of what is, technically speaking, a foreign land. Even more unique is the fact that they are here to discuss freely their views of the United States foreign policy. We, in this part of America called Canada, are most anxious to have our friends, in that part of America called the United States, know what we think of their foreign policy. There is little doubt that we will get some frank statements aired before this evening's meeting is concluded.

U. S. foreign policy is a controversial issue in the U. S. What our attitude to that foreign policy should be is an equally controversial matter in Canada. We have been fortunate tonight in obtaining speakers with widely diverse viewpoints; people representative of the political views held by many Canadians.

Our first speaker on this occasion will be Mr. Arthur Laing, well-known political figure in this area. Mr. Laing resigned his seat in the Federal Parliament to take over the leadership of the British Columbia Liberal Party, and now sits at

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

the head of that party in the Legislature of this Province of British Columbia. Now, Mr. Laing, may we hear from you with your opinion!

MR. LAING: The question asked us tonight should provide ample disagreement to make for the safety and security of democracy. There is in this question the implication that we, in Canada, must perforce follow the foreign policy of the United States, and that it remains for us tonight merely to demarcate the distance by which we should tag along in the rear. As a citizen of a free and sovereign nation which has decided to run its own affairs and, at the same time, remain loyal to the British Crown, I must insist that we refuse to follow the policy of any other nation. Foreign policy in a coalition working for peace is bound to work collectively if it is to succeed. In this world of interdependence, foreign policy cannot be drafted in any one country or made in any one capital -- no matter how powerful that country is. No partner, however strong, can either be honored or strengthened by mere followers. Nations, like people, expect their partners to have something to contribute. We, of Canada, have much to offer. We are growing rapidly in population. A belated spirit of nationalism is now awakened. We possess a confidence beyond the numbers of our citizens and we are a vast reservoir of the resources of both defense and human improvement. We are the least likely people on the face of the earth to possess territorial ambitions. We seek freedom and opportunity because it was in their search that we populated this land. Our generosity within our means, and our readiness to respect the views of others, have made us the admiration of all freedom-loving nations and the envy of most. Peace -- total world peace -- is the first consideration of every Canadian.

Our foreign policy must be our own, with the interest of our sovereign people of first concern and affected only by our commitments to our allies and to the United Nations.

The pursuit of peace in which we are engaged in coalition consists in limiting conflicts, preventing them from spreading and ending them. But foreign policy encompasses other responsibilities. Human material improvement in depressed nations and the encouragement of democratic ideals. It is not difficult to explain the admiration Canadians possess for the unparalleled generosity of the American people since the end of the war. I will not admit we are less generous here, but the economic history of our exports and the necessity of maintaining our balance of international payments prevents the same open-handed charity.

In matters of trade between the two countries, we are on thorny paths. Congress has tripped us up on everything from oats and hardboard to flatfish. Our protests are loud because these are bread and butter items for Canada, and we think Congress is ignoring its obligation under the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

Mr. Moderator, if the question has inferences tonight, they are not difficult of explanation. Canada is a Pacific nation, and it is to be expected that our views on security would closely coincide with those of the United States, the world's most powerful free nation whose interests in the Pacific are paramount. But even here, Canada did not blindly follow. Our Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, informed the world we would accept no responsibility in the defense of the offshore islands of the China Coast. Canadians would be more than pardoned if, in the European sphere, we found our views most often coincided with those of the leaders of the United Kingdom. We would be shocked indeed to find irreconcilable breaches in the policies advanced by our great neighbor to the south and our common Mother, the United Kingdom.

The immediate policy of the communist disrupters is to drive a wedge between the British and American peoples and their governments. The Anglo-American Alliance is the one indispensable basis for peace. It must include a parallel policy of seeking the confidence of the peoples of Asia and Africa. Canada has been and can remain the golden hinge to Anglo-American understanding.

Some otherwise sensible people have been heard to say in recent months that they would sooner have peace than have the American alliance. Nothing is so fatuous as that because there can be no such choice. We know it is possible to have peace and the alliance. We certainly could not have peace for long without it.

MR. HELPS: Thank you, Mr. Laing. Our second speaker is Mr. Leon Ladner, Queens Counsel, a former member of Parliament for Vancouver, a past president of Rotary, member of the Senate of the University of British Columbia, and a member of an old and prominent pioneer family in British Columbia. As a barrister and solicitor, he is a noted corporation counsel and a leader in western Canadian business circles. Mr. Leon J. Ladner!

MR. LADNER: Thank you Mr. Moderator, ladies and gentlemen and radio listeners. I shall try to present to you what I consider to be the vital factors affecting the formation of public opinion -- and later we will then discuss the specific problems. May I say at the outset that the average Canadian citizen wants no petty partisan politics in Canada's foreign policy. Civilization is at stake in today's difficult problems. In a world struggling to regain its equilibrium with two billion people longing for peace, we believe that the United Nations with its imperfections offers the best chance to a hopeful world.

Statesmanship of the highest level has dominated the policies of the United States. In Canada and the United States, statesmanship is often hindered by the limitations of democracy. Suspicion, intolerance, self-interest, and excessive nationalism frequently distort large sections of the voting public. Although Canada is a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, along with Great Britain -- all on an equal basis -- we are, nevertheless, an entirely independent nation. We don't follow anyone. We march on toward the millenium of peace, arm in arm with our trustworthy friends, as equals and not as followers.

Historically and constitutionally, Canada has inherited much from Great Britain, particularly her democratic institutions and the system of responsible government. However, powerful economic forces so vital to the welfare and happiness of our citizens, bind our two great countries.

One hundred years ago, Canada had for ten years a reciprocity trade agreement with the United States. In 1911, Canada rejected another such agreement. Today we are competitive on the world market in manufactured goods. Our business association is like that of a partnership. Many believe that the old cry of commercial union between Canada and the United States will be revived. I don't think so because tradition, custom, and political instincts of the Canadians make them jealous of their independence.

A great change has taken place. Canada makes her own foreign policies, but consults on an equal basis with the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Canada's foreign trade of thirty millions of dollars 100 years ago is now more than eight thousand million. Even until 1917 agriculture was the main source of income for the Canadian people. Today it is manufacturing and trade.

In 1954, and I ask you to mark these notes, 60% of our exports went to the United States, but only 16½% to Great Britain. Of our total imports, 75% comes from the United States and only 10% from Britain. This situation is bound to have an enormous effect on foreign policy. International trade, as is often said, is a two-way street and a low tariff policy is fundamental to its success. In defense and war we stand solidly with Great Britain and the United States, as we have done in two world wars. In policies relating to trade, then, ladies and gentlemen, we like to stop, look, and listen.

The United States, Great Britain and Canada dominate world trade. Huge profitable investments are made by the United States in the industries and resources of Canada, and thousands of American citizens are coming here. We welcome them wholeheartedly. Tremendous investments are, in fact, made by Canadians in the

United States -- a fact little known. May our governments inculcate into the minds of the average citizen the highest principles of international relationship. We should always remember that the greatness of a nation is in those qualities which constitute the greatness of the individual -- and that's your responsibility.

MR. HELPS: Thank you, Mr. Ladner. For our third speaker we have with us this evening Mr. M. J. Coldwell, the national leader of the CCF -- that's the Socialistic party in Canada -- a member of Parliament through five consecutive terms of public office, I believe, and one of the best-known political figures in this country. Mr. Coldwell, we're honored and happy to have you with us.

MR. COLDWELL: Mr. Moderator and ladies and gentlemen. When you ask me how far Canada should go in following the United States foreign policy, my immediate reaction is that since the war no one has known very definitely or very clearly -- not even Mr. Dulles -- what American foreign policy really is.

That, of course, is because no United States President or Cabinet can negotiate a joint policy with Canada or with any other country because nobody can be sure that Congress or rather the Senate will approve or confirm it. That being so, it is impossible to say with any certainty how far Canada should go in agreeing with United States policy.

Uncertainties regarding United States policy has not only been a factor in negotiating long-term policies, but my experience, both as a Delegate to the Assembly of the United Nations and as a Parliamentary observer there, has shown me that this uncertainty afflicts the United States delegates at the United Nations as well. Sudden switches from what seemed a firm delegation position have been made frequently on instructions from Washington and, therefore, it seems to me that Canada must not and could not follow United States foreign policy or, indeed, her external economic policy, until those who negotiate international agreements on behalf of the United States have the authority to do so. We've had very unfortunate experiences in the manner in which the Geneva Agreement on Tariffs and Trade have been violated by the United States, and not until the United States people are prepared to establish responsible government by constitutional amendment can any nation say how far they should go in following American foreign or domestic or international policy.

Now, my criticism of our Government has been and is that we have been too strongly influenced by United States foreign policy since the war. In saying this it mustn't be construed as evidence that I, or thousands who believe as I do, have any antipathy to the American people whom we regard as a great, generous and humanitarian nation. An attack on the continental United States from any quarter would, I believe, see Canada placing all her resources and giving assistance to repel an aggressor. Because we are aware of this, we should say plainly that aspects of American foreign policy have filled us with alarm. This has been particularly true of the United States Far Eastern policy over the past several years. Yet, because our Government has tried to be a good neighbor, Canada has at times followed United States leadership when she should have taken her own stand independently and according to her convictions.

The recognition of the hard fact that a government controls the mainland of China is a case in point. When India and the United Kingdom recognized this fact following the Commonwealth Colombo Conference in 1949, it was understood -- and I use the word "understood" advisedly -- that Canada would follow suit. We didn't do so because, I believe, Washington was annoyed that the United Kingdom and India had done so. Six months later the Korean War broke out -- a war which might not have developed as it did, if China had been recognized and seated at the United Nations. During the war, of course, the recognition of China quite properly remained in abeyance. But when the United Nations, under pressure from the United States, declared China an aggressor nation in February, 1951, Canada voted for the declaration in spite of the fact that our representative at Lake Success, our Minister of External

Affairs, the Honorable Lester Pearson, had characterized the declaration a few hours before he supported it as both premature and unwise -- his own words. Subsequent events confirmed his opinion, but not the wisdom of Canada's vote, cast because we followed United States policy.

So far though, we have remained aloof from United States policy in organizing the South East Asia Treaty Organization, which without India, Burma, Indonesia, and so on, has placed a propaganda card in the hands of our Communist rivals in Asia. It seems to Asians that this is an attempt to dominate Asia and impose a new sort of colonialism upon that continent.

We've made it clear too that we have no responsibility for the United States policy in Formosa, other than that which may be shared by all the members of the United Nations. Canada must continue to take her stand independently or in cooperation with other nations of like mind against an outbreak of further hostilities in this area. We should adhere to the statement made by President Truman on June 27, 1950, when the Korean War broke out, that an attack on Formosa from the mainland must be prevented and equally that Chiang Kai-shek must cease all operations against the mainland, which includes, of course, the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. To that extent, at least, Canada can follow a policy laid down by the former president.

Now I've stressed my confirmed opinion by citing a few examples that the United States foreign policy is not one Canada can follow or should follow blindly. We don't intend to substitute the 19th Century domination of our foreign policy by Downing Street for a policy made in Washington.

As near neighbors occupying the same continent, there must be the closest cooperation in continental defense. But it must be cooperation. Canadians accept this fundamental premise, and again because of this, we should speak up plainly and forthrightly when we consider the foreign policy of the United States to be wrong and likely to jeopardize peace.

MR. HELPS: Thank you, Mr. Coldwell. We will continue our Vancouver discussion after this message from our announcer.

ANNOUNCER: Tonight two national TOWN MEETING programs share the same platform -- TOWN MEETING IN CANADA and AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR -- a practical demonstration of the common heritage, beliefs, and ideals of the peoples who share the greater part of North America. We in Canada are proud of our country -- proud of its tremendous size and unconquered frontiers -- proud of its place in the markets of the world -- proud of the people who live here and form a culture that is theirs alone. We are conscious too that ours is a land of destiny, that the time-worn saying of "Go West, Young Man" has been changed to "Go North, Young Man" and we, in this hemisphere at least, are the North. From the 49th parallel to the pole, there is a stirring -- a feeling of change, a testing of the strength that comes from a larger population and a greater capital, and a realization that we are rich in the stuff that makes for greatness. We are but a step away from a new role as a powerful partner of our neighbor to the South, and a proven example to the world of the principle that nations can live together in peace.

Now we return you to AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING and your moderator, Mr. Arthur Helps.

MR. HELPS: Thank you. Our final speaker comes to us tonight from the United States. He is Mr. Geoffrey Harwood of Seattle, Washington. Mr. Harwood brings us a background of an education in England and radio and television work throughout the entire eastern United States. He is today recognized as an authority on British and United States relations. He is well-known in this area for his work as a news commentator for KING and KING-TV. Mr. Harwood, may we hear your opinion.

MR. HARWOOD: Speaking before the North Dakota Legislative Assembly at Bismarck last February, General Alfred Gruenther, the Commander-in-Chief of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Armed Forces, said this: "It is a question of forging an alliance which is going to last for years and years and years, often under very trying and

irritating conditions. All allies are not going to do what you want them to do. The only perfect allies, we feel, are ourselves; all the rest, we think, make mistakes. . . ."

It is blunt and realistic statements such as this which cause some people to feel General Gruenther is the indispensable man so far as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is concerned. Because there can be no getting away from the historical evidence that free and equal allies, working together in a common cause, whether it be waging a hot or a cold war, find that they have a difficult and trying job on their hands.

Every democratic nation tries to put its best men at the top and, generally speaking, these men are good or they wouldn't be there. They certainly wouldn't be there unless they had strong opinions. Neither would they be there unless their fellow countrymen considered that their opinions were good.

Sometimes, however, these opinions are not always quite as sound as their authors think they are; sometimes it may be necessary to qualify these opinions; sometimes to compromise them and, sometimes even to discard them entirely.

There are other times when opinions have to be changed, not because they have anything basically wrong with them, but because of generally unknown pressures behind the scenes.

On many occasions these things can become highly irritating, and if this irritation is given a certain kind of treatment, it can become extremely dangerous to the alliance as a whole. This is what General Gruenther was driving at.

In the overwhelming majority of cases, there's a definite reason for a certain course of action being followed. This reason is not necessarily always right. It isn't, necessarily, always justified, and in fact, it isn't necessarily always honorable. But if irritation can be forced to give ground to patience and commonsense, the reason for the cause of the trouble can usually be brought out into the light and carefully examined.

It is completely unreasonable and unrealistic to suppose that the anti-communist alliance as represented by the Western powers, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Western European Union, et al, is going to operate without occasional misunderstanding and friction. This has never happened in allied undertakings in the past, and very few of us in this hall will ever live to see it happen.

Since complete elimination of irritation is out of the question, the sensible way to combat it is to admit it, face it, and if possible, remove the cause of it instead of foolishly allowing it to fester.

That's why get-togethers such as this one are of such value. The things which are disturbing people are tossed onto the table for all to see and discuss. And although all the loose ends may not be neatly trimmed, at least we know why so-and-so did such an apparently stupid thing and why such-and-such appeared to open his mouth and put his foot in it. Perhaps he actually did; and how gratifying that discovery is.

MR. HELPS: Thank you, Mr. Harwood. Now if you'll gather round for a few minutes, gentlemen, we'll have a few moments of questioning, so come over please and we'll start the questioning off. Now, tonight we'll move right along, and I think the first thing that we'll do -- I see one of our friends in the audience here is a visitor from the United States, equally well-known in Canada as in the United States. I happen to know that he has an engagement somewhere else, but he dropped in to be with us for a little while. He's waving down there now that he wants to ask a question, and the gentleman that I recognize is everybody's friend, Mr. Duke Ellington.

MR. ELLINGTON: Thank you very much. I, as a musician, would like to know what you think music can contribute to the further cementing of our friendships, that is, between this beautiful big country and the United States.

MR. LADNER: Well, my distinguished friend, I think music is the one common language that we all understand. It tickles the heart of the statesman -- stimulates the feet of the gay people, and animates the spirit of the dull, and all in all, when you've danced to Duke Ellington's music, I'm sure all of you could sing an answer, even though I'm saying it in the most prosaic manner.

MR. COLDWELL: I would say to Mr. Ellington, it all depends on the music because, after all, I've been hearing music the last year or two that I couldn't distinguish from disharmony. Perhaps though I am a bit of a radical, I'm a bit of a conservative as far as music is concerned, and so I say to Mr. Ellington -- it all depends on the music. There is some music that would make war, and I'm not referring to the bagpipes.

MR. HELPS: Mr. Harwood, do you have a comment?

MR. HARWOOD: Nothing except: music, music, music!

MR. LAING: I think it is generally agreed that music and all the arts are international and if we're going to be at peace, we're going to be international too.

MR. HELPS: Well, perhaps we can go right along. Since, Mr. Laing, you were the first to speak, you can perhaps give us a comment or a question now.

MR. LAING: My first remark is that we Canadians, at least, seem to be united in one attitude that we shouldn't follow anyone, and I was rather of the opinion that our good American friend would compliment us for that attitude.

MR. HARWOOD: I have no such intention of complimenting you because there is no question nowadays -- it isn't a question of following or being led -- but it is a question of cooperation. I believe you said yourself in your opening remarks, didn't you, that there was no such thing nowadays as an individual foreign policy. Well, I think where you're confused, if that's not an unpleasant word to use, is that just because you do not have an independent foreign policy, that doesn't mean that you have to have a subservient foreign policy. All I can tell you is that my experience in the United States tells me that nobody that I know, and I know thousands and thousands and thousands of people and have, for 35 years -- nobody feels about it the way you apparently do. We certainly do not feel that we are dictating policy to anybody, least of all, Canada.

MR. COLDWELL: I think quite often unconsciously the United States does, in effect, dictate foreign policy. It's such a great and powerful country that what it does or does not do affects the foreign policies of all the other countries. I gave two or three examples when I was speaking a little while ago of American policy which, I think, was imposed upon our people by our government, because of the influences from the United States. They may be unconscious influences, but they are influences.

MR. HARWOOD: Now, wait a minute. I'm not so sure about that. What I think is, you hear a great deal of comment, and certainly to a great extent it is justified comment, about, and we'll put this into quotation marks -- "the vacillation of United States foreign policy." Well, a good deal of this vacillation is due to finding out how other people feel. In other words, the United States might have some fairly definite form of foreign policy which it wanted to expound and since we have an entirely different parliamentary system from yours, the only way that we can get this across is to shoot up a trial balloon. So somebody in a press conference suggests that this might be the foreign policy and we listen. Now, what's the reaction going to be? If the reaction is adverse, then we pull in our horns and try to find the compromise. Then we are accused of vacillating. Well, of course, to the outside world very often that's exactly how it does appear.

MR. LADNER: Mr. Coldwell made remarks that I interpreted to mean that Canada had some responsibility about the Korean War. Now I would like to ask him this simple question, which is a specific problem that I referred to in my address, one of them, this simple question: Would Mr. Coldwell believe that China should be admitted to the United Nations and that Chiang Kai-shek and Formosa should remain under trusteeship of the United Nations?

MR. COLDWELL: Well, certainly I believe that it is a fact that there is a government in Peiping which controls the mainland of China. That is the government of China. Now that we're no longer at war with Korea, it should be admitted to the United Nations and Chiang Kai-shek and his occupying army in Formosa should be removed from that island or, at least, put in a position where they can't begin a war.

MR. LADNER: By the Chinese?

MR. COLDWELL: By the Chinese or by anybody else.

MR. LAING: I was delighted at Mr. Harwood's explanation. There are, however, allies of the great United States who would at times, I think, want the balloon to go up before the action is taken.

MR. HARWOOD: I think that's a point that's very well taken, and I can assure Mr. Laing that there is a tremendous amount of criticism in the United States among newspeople, radio people and TV people because, believe me, on occasions we have to do doubletakes too because we read the news and then we find, maybe two or three hours later, that news has changed. Therefore, I do agree with Mr. Laing that there have been many, many times when it would have been advisable if, as he says, the balloon had gone up after it had been announced that the rope was going to be cut.

MR. LADNER: Mr. Harwood, I would like to ask you, if you are permitted to answer the question, the same question I asked Mr. Coldwell. Do you think, from the point of view of the United States, that if Formosa was placed under the trusteeship of the United Nations, that it is fitting now to admit China as a member of the United Nations?

MR. HARWOOD: All I can tell you, Mr. Ladner is this, and again I must remind you this is my own opinion -- I am not expressing the opinion of the State Department because, frankly, I don't know it. But, as a newsman of fifteen years experience, I will answer that question this way -- that it will not be too long, I do not believe, before the United States will recognize Communist China.

MR. COLDWELL: I believe that what Mr. Harwood says is perfectly correct, but Mr. Ladner should remember this: that when China was recognized by the Labor Government of Britain in January, 1950, Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden both expressed their approval of the steps taken. Consequently, it's not a question of whether labor or socialists, or so on, want China recognized because the old Tories of Britain were equally convinced that it should be undertaken. I am in agreement with Mr. Harwood that before long Canada will do it because the United States is going to do it.

MR. HELPS: Now, ladies and gentlemen, we can start turning to the audience here to get some of the questions. The hall is jam-packed and there are people outside, and we regret that it is unfortunate that we can only get a certain number of these questions from such a large audience. Would you start the questioning, madam:

QUESTIONER: Mr. Ladner, foreign trade is vital to Canada. Why has Canada deferred to the United States wishes and not traded with Russia and China, as Britain has?

MR. LADNER: That's a tough question. I would say that it is an indication of the independence of Canada on foreign policy, and that trade with China at this stage, with the complicated situation in the Orient would not be in keeping with our general policy here, nor with the policy which the United States and the United Nations have enunciated.

MR. COLDWELL: May I add just one word to that. Of course, all we are bound to do is to stop the flow of strategic material. We could trade in other materials if we so wished.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Coldwell, there has been recently formed a continuing conference of democratic socialist parties in the Asian countries. What in your opinion could be the effect of such an organization on world affairs and the future relations between Canada and the United States?

MR. COLDWELL: Well, of course, this organization which has been formed, largely at Rangoon where the bureau is situated, indicates that the Asian countries and indeed the African countries are moving in the direction that all the world in reality is moving and is thinking, at least, if not in its political expressions. That is to say, towards the democratic socialist philosophy which governs so many of the progressive nations of the world. Such an organization can do much to bring about a better understanding among all the peoples of the world, and one of these days the people of the United States will join with other peoples in building a society which will be based on the fundamental principles of production for the good of mankind, rather than the profits of a few individuals and corporations.

MR. HARWOOD: Isn't there a danger there, Mr. Coldwell, that where these Asian people are concerned, since they are, we must admit, politically inexperienced and a democratic socialist form of government is an extremely intricate, sophisticated form of government -- isn't it a little likely that these people, being politically inexperienced are going to have themselves moved in on by the Communists and taken over?

MR. COLDWELL: I don't think there is any danger of that. As a matter of fact, the Communists can move in where people are depressed and in misery. The breeding ground of Communism is poverty, misery and want and insofar as the policies of democratic socialists are based upon the removal of these social evils, that will stop the spread of either Communism or what is equally bad, remember, though we don't hear it talked about very much, Fascism -- still a threat to the world.

MR. LAING: Unless the accounts of the first meeting were highly distorted, there was a great deal of division in their first meeting, and the Communists were certainly there, inside and outside.

MR. COLDWELL: No, no. You're thinking of the Bandung Conference. I was talking of the Rangoon Conference which was confined to socialists and Mr. Atlee, incidentally, was there.

MR. LAING: There will be some movement there and it will have to be carefully watched. I agree with Mr. Harwood, and I think Mr. Coldwell agrees too.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Laing, how can we reconcile the Colombo Plan with the United States foreign policy?

MR. LAING: We in Canada, I think, should be very proud of our Colombo Plan. Many Canadians think that we're not doing enough. However, independent opinion is very high in its praise of the attitude of Canada and Australia, particularly, I would say, because they have been two great contributors. How do we relate it? We relate it to their Point IV technical aid program. This is our comparative contribution, and it is a very real contribution in Southeast Asia, and I think, doing a magnificent job. We can bring the countries of that area along by technical aid better than by any other method, including outright gifts.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Coldwell, should Canada take the initiative in trying to obtain a United Nations investigation into the after effects of each bomb experiment?

MR. COLDWELL: My answer, of course, is a categorical "Yes." As a matter of fact, I suggested that to Mr. Pearson in the House of Commons very recently. Indeed these experiments that are going on over the world bear this in mind. Churchill has said that 50 hydrogen bombs would destroy the world and yet, we are conducting experiments in the explosion of hydrogen bombs, diffusing across the world radio-active material which could do great damage to the human race, and indeed, the other day in the Pacific, without any consultation with Canada, a Pacific country, they let one off to kill the fishes in the Pacific Ocean.

MR. HARWOOD: Do you think, Mr. Coldwell, that in this investigation of the damage done by hydrogen bomb experiments you would get cooperation from the Soviet Union?

MR. COLDWELL: No, I don't think so. But, on the other hand, I think that if brought before the United Nations, you would have an opportunity of trying to get that cooperation and the Russians are as much afraid of the hydrogen bomb and the experiments as we are, and consequently, that fear might help them to join with us in eliminating this great danger to the human race.

MR. HARWOOD: That fear did not help them to join us in controlling the original atomic energy.

MR. COLDWELL: I want to say this: The control of the original atomic energy was in the hands of the United States alone, and even Canada was kept out of an understanding of the atomic energy and the various implications of it.

MR. HARWOOD: I'm talking about the control of it, Mr. Coldwell.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Harwood, is the current Soviet so-called peace offensive genuine?

MR. HARWOOD: No, it is not. It is simply a softening up process because the Chinese Communists think, and they may be right, that the psychological moment has arrived in the United States for recognition. They may be right, they may be wrong -- I personally think they are right. What the State Department believes I do not know, but they believe that the psychological moment has arrived. Why not push it a step or two forward by showing a little cooperation.

MR. COLDWELL: On both sides.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Coldwell, since you value consistency in foreign affairs so highly, how can you reproach the United States for an uncertain policy when, in your own CCF Party, your national executive voted against the re-arming of Germany -- yet you personally and half your members voted for it?

MR. COLDWELL: First of all, I would suggest to the gentleman that he read the resolution. The resolution was not mandatory in the sense that he has stated, and while I recognize that in all parties in Parliament there was considerable mis-giving about the re-arming of Germany, I came to the conclusion after examining all the factors involved that we should be better off in re-arming Germany under supervision than letting Germany arm herself when she obtained her sovereignty, as she was about to do, without any supervision. That's the answer.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Ladner, how much does economic competition for raw materials and markets dictate our foreign policy and that of the United States?

MR. LADNER: Well, we are competitors with the United States. We live in the same market, and they are competitive markets, and I don't think that the foreign policy on the matters that we are discussing have any effect upon that. All kinds of misunderstandings arise, but the fact is that in the North American continent, we are in a happy position, free from the dictatorship of some countries where the raw materials and essential things for manufacturing are bid at in competitive markets.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Harwood, would not Canada's appreciation of the U. S. A. foreign policy be stronger if they seek to treat 15 million friends of Duke Ellington as second-class citizens?

MR. HARWOOD: My reply to that question is that I have lived in the United States for 35 years, and the changes that I have seen develop in that time and the advances that have been taken are incredible, and they will continue. It is a difficult problem. It cannot be overcome overnight. There is a sincere desire, and it is being done.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Laing, in view of the fact that the United States appears to be setting its own foreign policy to suit its own purpose, particularly as regards agricultural tariffs, how long do you think Canada can follow this policy without seriously affecting our national economy?

MR. LAING: I agree that my friend asked a good question, because this is a matter for external affairs. This is foreign policy. If we are in an alliance with our great and sometimes almost smothering friend to the South, we don't want them to rub us out, you know, and we don't want them to do things that make our

economy weak, or might make our economy weak. My friend asks: how long? We are with the United States in a general agreement in respect to tariffs and trade, and there have been some bulwarks put up against the entry of Canadian products recently. So far, our Canadian government has not retaliated. We have endeavored to negotiate and we will continue to negotiate, but we are going to be very annoyed indeed if the spirit of protectionism is revived in the United States. It would not be good for us, and because of our geography today and our importance to the alliance, it would not be good for the United States either.

MR. HARWOOD: And that, ladies and gentlemen, is what the Eisenhower Administration is trying to convince Congress about.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Coldwell, what, in your opinion, is the most effective contribution Canada and the United States can make toward building world peace?

MR. COLDWELL: I think, of course, more aid in the fields of technical aid and plans like the Colombo Plan and the Point IV program of the United States. I said a little earlier, and I repeat, that the best assurance of peace throughout the world is to speed up the elimination of misery, poverty, and want. Remember, two out of every three men, women, and children on this earth tonight will go to bed hungry, and as long as that remains, we are not secure.

QUESTIONER: Mr. Ladner, should Canadian foreign policy lean closer to the United States or to the British foreign policy.

MR. LADNER: I think the Canadian foreign policy doesn't lean particularly close to either. It depends upon the particular problems. We act with the approval and in cooperation with the United Nations. Generally speaking, the background of our sentiment and tradition has been British. The economic development of our country has given us a new position, and each problem must be gauged in the best interests of this country and world peace.

MR. HARWOOD: Have I time to add a word? I would just say that if you do follow more closely Britain's foreign policy than you do the United States, you will still be following United States foreign policy because Britain's foreign policy is 90% United States.

MR. COLDWELL: I'd like to say a word.

MR. HELPS: Mr. Coldwell, I'm sorry. I know very well how much you disagree, but ladies and gentlemen, our broadcast time is at an end.

Our thanks to you, Mr. M. J. Coldwell, Mr. Arthur Laing, Mr. Leon Ladner, and Mr. Geoffrey Harwood for your fine contribution to this TOWN MEETING IN CANADA, originating in the Hotel Georgia Ballroom in Vancouver, British Columbia, as an exchange program with AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR in the United States.

Our thanks also to Radio Station CJOR in Vancouver, British Columbia, and the international Town Meeting Committee, George Home, Don Lanskail, Russell Underhill, Walter Dent, and Herbert Price, and to the British Columbia Government and the public-spirited business firms who helped to make this program possible.